PERSUASION

published by
PERSUASION, INC.
260 west 86 street, n.y.c.

35¢

JOAN KENNEDY TAYLOR, EDITOR

distributed by the
Metropolitan Young Republican Club

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I-5

Volume I, No. 5 December 1, 1964

V I E W S

"Will the real Mr. Republican please stand up?"

THE REPUBLICAN DILEMMA

Where do we go from here? The heavy defeat suffered by the Republicans on November 3 has raised this question, a question which must be answered if the future of the party is to be determined. Many well-known personalities in the Republican ranks have made repeated suggestions that Goldwater be replaced as party leader by a man of different political persuasion. These suggestions overlook the fact that much of the political party structure is built upon tradition. The manner in which party leadership and control is earned by individuals has fallen into a pattern which can be described as a semi-contract with party members. (In fact, the national committee chairman -- Burch, in this case -- does hold a legal four-year contract.) Except in the case of a serious crime or physical disability, the most recent candidate for the presidency is expected to retain control of the party until

© Metropolitan Young Republican Club 1964

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I-5

the question is re-opened at the next convention. Many people who work for a candidate might not if they thought he could be arbitrarily ousted. Goldwater is neither a criminal nor a cripple; party members, from candidates to precinct workers, are reasonable in assuming that he will continue in the role of party leader. If his opponents, from the left or the right, wish to overthrow his leadership, they have four years in which to gain support in precisely the same manner Goldwater did.

This answers part of the question, but there still remains the larger, more important issue -- what long-range direction should the party take? Out of the still raging public controversy, three alternatives have emerged:

Beat the Democrats at their own game.

Return to the policy of compromise between "progress" and "tradition."

Continue to build on the current trend.

The first suggestion encourages the liberal faction to take hold. This will surely lead us to victory, it is claimed, since the Democratic landslide on November 3 clearly indicated a preference for the Johnson-Humphrey policies. It is believed that the American voters have endorsed the idea of cradle-to-grave security, an idea that can materialize only by way of greater and greater government controls at the price of a corresponding loss of individual freedom. Without disputing this particular interpretation of the vote, the faults in this point of view can be argued. If the Republicans play "follow the leader," and both parties espouse essentially the same ideas, it will reduce the next election to a political tug-of-war. The issue will not be one of ideas, but of which gang can yell the loudest. Furthermore, the Republicans are at a decided disadvantage in the liberal camp. If a voter prefers liberalism, why not elect the Democrats who are skilled and experienced at it and who support their policies with at least a working knowledge of how to implement them. The Democrats have a long tradition behind them dating from Franklin Roosevelt -- years of liberal legislation, scores of bureaus to their credit, and numerous tax-supported economic ventures. In short, the Democrats are welfare-state wizards. Can the Republicans even hope to compete with this?

The second idea is to adopt a policy of moderation. In other words, political fence-straddling, an attitude that is far from new to the Republicans. It is a cry for the return to pragmatic politics where fundamental principles are replaced with what is called practical expediency, aimed at winning elections at any cost. In this instance, the party would follow no set plan of action, but rather assume a wait-and-see attitude, attempting never to take a firm stand on anything in advance of somehow "feeling out" the current trend of thinking. This is playing both ends against the middle, abandoning all genuine standards by which to judge any issue. A party with no principles is no better than a man with no principles. It wanders aimlessly and meaninglessly to eventual defeat.

The third alternative reaches us from the conservatives who are holding on tenaciously to the control of the party for which they fought so long and hard.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I #5

"Don't give up the fight," they urge, convinced that the 26 million votes for Goldwater represent the first step in the right direction. While the conservative element of the party does stand for a trend away from statism, I cannot agree that we should continue in the pattern established in the recent campaign. With Barry Goldwater as their champion, the conservatives vigorously fought for concepts they believed to be sacred -- self-determination and individual rights. But their battle amounted to little more than futile gestures in the name of ideals which were not clearly defined nor justified. They have never questioned the principle by which government assumes the right to fill men's needs by taking from some and giving to others. The interpretation of this year's election and the landslide Democratic vote will probably always be somewhat of an open question, but for Republicans, one thing is clear. In total, Goldwater's campaign was not conducted in terms of fundamental principles. The basic crucial choice of individual rights versus collectivism was never satisfactorily explained nor carried out to its full implications. It was only sometimes discussed, and too-often inserted among many comparatively superficial issues.

I suggest that none of the three alternatives presented solve the Republican dilemma. In order to succeed, a new course must be followed -- the course of ideas. The American people must be re-educated in political philosophy: they must be given a clear, full, principled discussion of their inherent rights; and, most important, of the inexorable tie of this concept to laissez-faire capitalism as the only proper economic expression of this view of man. If the Republicans will take a firm, philosophically founded stand for capitalism, giving it the proper defense it so eloquently deserves, the party would take on a stature it has never known before -- the stature of an unprecedented commitment to freedom.

--Lois Roberts

R E V I E W S

<u>The Democrat's Dilemma</u>, by Philip M. Crane, Assistant Professor at Bradley University, Regnery, 1964

If you've ever wondered how welfare-statism took root in the United States, without the violence and bloodshed that Marx had predicted would accompany crucial social change, this book will be of some help to you. Mr. Crane has given us a brief history of the events of what has been called the Fabian Revolution, first in England, then in America, with considerable attention to the methods employed in bringing it about.

Having decided that what the world needed was socialism, a small group in England which called itself the Fabian Society got together shortly after the turn of the century and did nothing but study for three years. The Fabians

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I-5

studied every possible aspect and application of socialist theory, and emerged knowing all there was to know (except how ghastly the results of it would be). Then they set out to educate the world accordingly.

They wrote books and articles and pamphlets, they lectured extensively, they founded the London School of Economics, they held summer school seminars, and promoted and assisted study and discussion groups all over England. They founded a research bureau to provide labor unions with the facts and figures needed for the most effective negotiations, and handled public relations for them as well. When legislators were concerned with social reforms of any kind, the Fabians were always handy with thoroughly researched and documented data and programs -- very often, if a legislator was sympathetic or just plain lazy, they drafted the appropriate legislation as well. "During their years of preparation for political warfare," reports Mr. Crane, "the Fabians had conducted 'amateur Parliaments,' where they gained invaluable experience in the parliamentary arts, putting their proposals into black and white in the form of bills, and then defending them."

The pattern was not very different in America. When Upton Sinclair "discovered" socialism, he decided that something had to be done about it, and set out to found the Intercollegiate Socialist Society. The purpose of I.S.S. was to promote and assist socialist clubs and study-and-discussion groups on college campuses. Shortly thereafter, in 1906, a close associate of Sinclair's, George Herron, founded the Rand School of Social Science, "a sort of 'West Point' for turning out well-indoctrinated Socialist leaders who could carry the millenial message into the labor movement, the pulpit, the classroom, and the congressional halls." It held classes (in philosophy, history, economics and trade unionism) in the evenings so that working men would be able to attend ("Close cooperation between the Rand School and the labor movement existed from the beginning"), but also attracted many students from other walks of life.

By 1910, fifteen major colleges and universities had socialist study groups to which the I.S.S. contributed literature and speakers when possible. Harvard students, led by Walter Lippmann, had even succeeded in getting a course in socialism introduced into the curriculum. Events at home and abroad during the 20's had made the word socialism unpopular, and socialist advocates of "permeation" rather than "revolution" were obligingly substituting for it expressions like industrial democracy and liberalism. Thus, the I.S.S. became the League for Industrial Democracy (L.I.D.) "By 1925, according to the L.I.D. News Bulletin, 35,000 students a year were exposed to the L.I.D. message through its speakers' bureau." Many thousands more were reached through written material.

As the English Fabians had done, the American socialists wooed and won labor by being Johnny-on-the-spot with all kinds of help--pro-labor propaganda, students to march in picket lines, food for the families of strikers. The AFL trade unions responded with indifference and even resistance, but when industrial unionism was made possible

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I-5

in the thirties and the CIO came into the picture, this strategy paid off. With CIO leaders largely educated, indoctrinated and supported by socialist assistance of all kinds, the newly organized semi-skilled workers provided a huge captive audience for every kind of indoctrination that could be tried out on them. Today, one of the most effective educational organizations is C.O.P.E., the (AFL-CIO's Committee on Political Education) and the chapters dealing with its methods of indoctrinating the fifteen million men and women in unions in this country make fascinating reading.

It was not until such educational activities had been well established that the Fabians began to engage in direct political action. They had long since chosen the Democratic party to "permeate," and quietly carried on a program of growing into positions of influence in it. By 1932, a man who would carry out many of their programs had not only been nominated for President, but elected. He was to lead the country for the rest of his life.

There are some flaws in this book, one of which, organization, is of major importance. The pattern for the overwhelming success of the socialist revolutions here and in England has been: educate yourself, broadcast your ideas and educate others, make yourself the voice of whatever issues and groups are appropriate by the standards of your political philosophy, then start on direct political action. Unfortunately, by being narrowly topical rather than chronological, the organization of the book obscures the pattern more than it emphasizes it. For that matter, it obscures the order of events to the point where the reader has great difficulty in following it without constant backtracking.

I also regretted Crane's unwillingness to deal with ideas more than he absolutely has to. Ideas after all do have content. While the socialists (under whatever names) have certainly done an astonishingly efficient job of spreading their ideas, I doubt whether their success would have been anything to shout about had their ideas consisted of a political philosophy based on palmistry or ancestor worship. You can indoctrinate till you're blue in the face -- if the ideas you are advocating don't have anything but your fervor to recommend them, you aren't going to make many converts, and the ones you do make aren't going to be able to help you very much.

The Democrats did have some kind of political philosophy which socialism has replaced by the means Mr. Crane describes. What was it? Why was it able to be replaced by those methods? The socialist view did have many arguments in its favor -- it had to have in order to be able to attract as many people as it has attracted, and as many intelligent people. What were they and why were they attractive?

Jameson G. Campaigne, editor of The Indianapolis Star, suggests this book is a blueprint for those who want to change the world again. But a blueprint starts with the basement, not the fifth floor; a political revolution starts with a philosophy,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I-5

not with methods of indoctrination. Furthermore, the foundations of a building often determine what the upper stories consist of.

Mr. Crane calls his book a plea to Democrats to retake their own party. It is here that it is important to answer the question, "With what?" An idea has to be countered with another idea -- not just with a method.

The only effective answer to socialism is libertarianism: the doctrine of limited government, strictly protected rights, and free enterprise. But the Republican party (mixed as it may be in ideas) is the natural home of libertarianism. A good part of the Democrat's dilemma is that they have as yet no idea to retake their party with.

--Avis Brick

P E R S U A S I O N

* * * * *

HOW TO BUILD THE GREAT SOCIETY
(OR, LET THE GOVERNMENT DO IT)
NEW YORK EDITION

Welfare: "State Welfare Commissioner George K. Wyman . . . said the state's underestimation /of welfare expenses/ amounted to $48.3 million. If the State Legislature grants that amount during this session, the state's expenditure would total $194,958,000 by next March 31, when the state's fiscal year ends. . . .

"Commissioner Wyman said the state had expected its welfare load to level off this year because of tax cuts and other anti-poverty measures. Even though these measures had their desired effect -- employment rose and the national income increased -- 'welfare case loads are not contracting,' said Mr. Wyman. 'They are expanding.'

"Commissioner Wyman said the main reason the anti-poverty measures did not improve the welfare situation is that the vast majority of welfare recipients are not considered employable. . . .

"Mayor Wagner said conventional approaches to the welfare program that were 'once bright with hope have turned into dead ends.'" New York Herald Tribune, 11/18/64

Education: "The long shadow of automation is everywhere and by 1970 there will be fewer jobs than before, and possibly hundreds of thousands more people on welfare in this city. Because the tragic fact is that our schools are failing us as rapidly as our social organizations. The vocational schools in this city are a joke (two-thirds of the students never graduate) and as Edgar May points out, in 'The Wasted Americans':

"'You cannot retrain a man to be a computer operator if he does not have basic arithmetic and reading skills. You cannot retrain a man for a machine-oriented industrial plant if he cannot read and comprehend a company manual and sometimes is unable to accurately fill out its personnel application blank.'" Pete Hamill and Francis Lee, N.Y. Herald Tribune,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I-5

Rent Control: "As a landlord, the rent of $105 per month for two rooms in a tenement house (as reported in your Tuesday chapter of the welfare series) seems to me unconscionable. If rent control permits such rent, then rent control is a fraud upon the poor of New York City.

"I am compelled by law to rent for under $30 per month per room in a clean, decent elevator apartment on lower Central Park West. My controlled tenants can afford trips to Europe and Miami and a car, while rent control permits charges such as you cite and claims such controls are necessary to protect the poor.

"Is there an unholy alliance between these slum landlords, the Welfare Department and the rent control officials?" Arthur T. Kaplan, Letters to the Editor, New York Herald Tribune, 11/20/64

Meanwhile, on Sunday, November 23, Governor Nelson Rockefeller announced that necessary tax increases in New York State may amount to a total of $485 million in additional funds for additional programs.

What was it President Johnson said? Let us continue? We say, let us re-evaluate.

* * * * *

WE, THE INDUSTRIOUS

In a speech to his alma mater, Southwest Texas State College, President Johnson pledged budgetary emphasis on an "expansion of education" in the following words:

"We must move to enlarge the horizons of all Americans, and this effort is what we will pursue in the Great Society. We do not make money just to build factories. We make money to make it possible to enrich the lives of human beings...."

Won't someone please tell the President that he has things turned around? We build factories in order to make money -- that is why we are referred to as an industrial society. To talk about "just" building factories, as if this were some sort of unimportant or even slightly shameful activity, is to ignore the very basis of the standard of living which the Great Societarians (Great Socialists? What do they call themselves?) want everyone to have.

If we want "to enrich the lives of human beings," how do we expect to do it except with the products produced in factories. If we are talking about money spent on education -- don't we need factories to produce building materials, plumbing supplies, lighting fixtures, gymnasium equipment, flooring, lockers, desks, chairs, blackboards, erasers, pencils, paper, and even printing presses? To say nothing of more modern equipment such as closed circuit television systems, motion picture projectors, typewriters, and teaching machines.

If President Johnson is talking about spending money on higher salaries for teachers, if we didn't have factories, what would they spend the money on? If they couldn't buy automobiles, nylon stockings, phonograph records, furniture, dishes, cameras or cigarettes, perhaps their present salaries would be quite sufficient.

Anyway, who is "we"? Is it merely royal? Or does it mean we who are in government, which means we who are going to plan the Great Society? In that case, perhaps it could be pointed out that obtaining money by taxation is not the same thing as making it. There is only one process by which a government can truly be said to "make" money; and we hope that President Johnson is not implying that he will finance the Great Society by getting out his little printing press and making some.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED